

REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, and 16 are amended. Applicants do not add or cancel any claims. Claims 1-22 remain in the Application. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

A. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 16 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,393,520 issued to Yoshikawa et al. ("Yoshikawa").

To anticipate a claim, the Examiner must show that a single reference teaches each of the elements of that claim. Among other elements, amended Claim 1 includes the elements of "a control circuitry to copy display data from an external frame buffer to the internal frame buffer....wherein after the display data is copied, the same display data is located in the internal frame buffer and the external frame buffer until a new frame is available in the external frame buffer." Yoshikawa discloses a video controller that includes an internal memory and an external memory (FIG. 6). Data in the external memory that requires longer processing time or more frequent access is **exchanged** with data in the internal memory that requires less processing time or less frequent access (Abstract). After the data exchange, the external memory data is **replaced** by the internal memory data, and the internal memory data is likewise **replaced** by the external memory data. Thus, the video controller of Yoshikawa does not have the **same** display data located in the internal and the external frame buffers until a new frame is available in the external frame buffer, but rather has **different** data located in the internal and the external frame buffers after the completion of data exchange. Thus, Yoshikawa does not teach each of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Analogous discussions apply to independent Claims 9 and 16, which are similarly amended. In regard to Claims 2, 5-8, and 19-22, these claims respectively depend from Claims 1 and 16 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 1, Yoshikawa does not anticipate these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 16 and 19-22 are respectfully requested.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 3, 4, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,393,520 issued to Yoshikawa ("Yoshikawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,909,434 issued to Takala et al. ("Takala").

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the relied upon references must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art.

Claim 3 and 4 depend from amended Claim 1, and Claims 17 and 18 depend from amended Claim 16. The dependent claims incorporate all of the limitations of their respective base claims. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 1, Yoshikawa does not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claims 3, 4, 17, and 18.

Takala does not cure the defects of Yoshikawa. Takala is relied on for disclosing reading the display data from the internal frame buffer until receiving a signal indicating that the external frame buffer contains the most recent display data. However, Takala does not teach or suggest the use of a control circuitry to copy display data from an external frame buffer to the internal frame buffer, wherein after the display data is copied, the same display data is located in the internal frame buffer and the external frame buffer until a new frame is available in the external frame buffer. Thus, Yoshikawa in view of Takala does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claims 3, 4, 17, and 18 are requested.

B. Claims 9-11 and 13-15 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,015 issued to Cross ("Cross"), further in view of Takala.

Claim 9, as amended, includes the limitations of "after the display data is copied, the same display data is located in the internal frame buffer and the external frame buffer." Thus, for the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claims 1 and 3, Yoshikawa and Takala do not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 9 and its dependent Claims 10, 11, and 13-15.

Cross does not cure the defects of Yoshikawa and Takala. Cross is relied on for disclosing a graphics chip coupled between a processor and a display device. However, Cross does not teach or suggest the use of a control circuitry to copy display data from an external

frame buffer to the internal frame buffer, wherein after the display data is copied, the same display data is located in the internal frame buffer and the external frame buffer until a new frame is available in the external frame buffer, as recited in Claim 9. Thus, Yoshikawa in view of Takala and further in view of Cross does not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claims 9-11 and 13-15. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of these claims are requested.

C. Claim 12 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Yoshikawa, Cross, and Takala in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0150647 to Aleksic et al. ("Aleksic").

Claim 12 depends from Claim 9 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claim 9, Yoshikawa, Cross, and Takala do not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 12.

Aleksic does not cure the defects of Yoshikawa, Cross, and Takala. Aleksic is relied on for disclosing a graphics generator disposed on a graphics chip. However, Aleksic does not teach or suggest the use of a control circuitry to copy display data from an external frame buffer to the internal frame buffer, wherein after the display data is copied, the same display data is located in the internal frame buffer and the external frame buffer until a new frame is available in the external frame buffer. Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 12. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claim 12 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 21, 2006

Thomas M. Coester
Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,367

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (310) 820-5988

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Amber D. Saunders 8/21/06
Amber D. Saunders Date